MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

Seventy-Fourth Session
April 18, 2007

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman Bernie Anderson at 8:13 a.m., on Wednesday, April 18, 2007, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda (Exhibit A), the Attendance Roster (Exhibit B), and other substantive exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/74th/committees/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Bernie Anderson, Chairman
Assemblyman William Horne, Vice Chairman
Assemblywoman Francis Allen
Assemblyman John C. Carpenter
Assemblyman Ty Cobb
Assemblyman Marcus Conklin
Assemblywoman Susan Gerhardt
Assemblyman Ed Goedhart
Assemblyman Garn Mabey
Assemblyman Mark Manendo
Assemblyman Harry Mortenson
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall
Assemblyman Tick Segerblom

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman John Oceguera (Excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Barbara Cegavske, Clark County Senatorial District No. 8
Senator Valerie Wiener, Clark County Senatorial District No. 3

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jennifer M. Chisel, Committee Policy Analyst
Risa Lang, Committee Counsel
Kaci Kerfeld, Committee Secretary
Matt Mowbray, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ben Graham, Representative, Clark County District Attorney, Nevada District Attorneys Association
Robert Roshak, Sergeant, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Frank Adams, Executive Director of the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association
Lee Rowland, Representative, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada
Craig Kadlub, Representative, Clark County School District
Anne Loring, Representative, Washoe County School District
Cheryln "Cherie" Townsend, Representative, Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators; Director, Department of Juvenile Justice Services, Clark County
Michael J. Pomi, Representative, Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators; Director, Department of Juvenile Services, Washoe County
Michael Pedersen, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Elko County Juvenile Probation Department

Chairman Anderson:
[Meeting called to order and roll called.]

Let us open the hearing on Senate Bill 10.

Senate Bill 10: Prohibits certain acts relating to capturing or distributing an image of the private area of another person under certain circumstances. (BDR 15-5)

Senator Barbara Cegavske, Clark County Senatorial District No. 8:
Senate Bill 10 concerns video voyeurism. It prohibits someone from knowingly and intentionally capturing an image of the private area of another person

without the consent of the other person under circumstances that would otherwise provide a reasonable expectation of privacy. This bill prohibits anyone from distributing, transmitting or publishing an image that he knows or has reason to know was made under such circumstances. A person who violates either of these provisions is guilty of a category E felony. Senate Bill 10 also provides for the confidentiality of such images, but allows them to be used for legitimate law enforcement and correctional activities. They also may be inspected or released as necessary to allow a person charged with the violation and his attorney to prepare a defense. These images may be inspected or released under certain circumstances if authorized by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Some of you will remember the case of a young girl at the Rio Hotel. She was there with her parents observing the festivities. Unknown to the family, there was a man who had a camera on his shoe that was videotaping underneath their daughter's dress. When they found out what was going on, they alerted security who apprehended him. They later found out that they could not charge him with anything. Her parents were horrified that this could happen without consequences for the person. Another case involved dancers on the strip at one of the hotels. One of the stagehands had propped up a camera and was able to videotape them as they changed their wardrobe. Another case was about a young lady who rented an apartment in Reno. The landlord had offered to help her with her computer, and in doing so, he put cameras in her computer and throughout her apartment and was able to watch her bathe, sleep, dress and everything else that went on in that apartment. Somebody told her that they had seen her on a website. She had been videotaped without her consent and it had been aired. Those people are the reason that I bring this bill forward again to you this session.

Ben Graham, Representative, Clark County District Attorney, Nevada District Attorneys Association:
This bill has been very refined. It has been worked over for several sessions. Any objections from the defense or media have been addressed in this. The examples that Senator Cegavske has given are just a few of what we have seen over the years. This would provide a tool that would not be used a great deal but certainly could be used as a deterrent to address this violation of privacy.

Assemblyman Mortenson:
What you are doing is very good and something needs to be done in this area. However, I worry about the unintended consequences. Being a photographer myself for about 60 years, I worry about the trouble that photographers could get into such as, for example, the Janet Jackson fiasco that happened at the Super Bowl. If you happened to be in the audience and had taken a picture,

could you be in trouble? If it was accidental, you probably are and if it was intentional you probably are not.

Senator Cegavske:
Janet Jackson knowingly did what she did. In that type of a setting, she had no expectancy of privacy. She did not expect that people would not be taking pictures. This is geared more towards when you are in your home or underneath clothing. Those are areas that you would expect privacy. Doing what she did out in public does not have the same support that this bill would render for someone in a different circumstance.

Assemblyman Mortenson:
If this were really an accident and you took a picture, could you be in trouble?

Ben Graham:
It mandates addressing those who intentionally capture the image of the private area. It is debatable what is private and what is not. Britney Spears also had an incident where a private area was exposed, but again, it was in public. Unless there is a reasonable expectation of privacy and unless you are intentionally exposing yourself, you are not going to be covered here. Incidental or casual photographs would not fall under this provision.

Senator Cegavske:
When I worked with Ken Laud from the Nevada Press Association, one of the issues brought up was for *Time* magazine, or one of the other national magazines. They were taking pictures where there was devastation and people were running with whatever clothing they had on. They wondered if that would be an issue. After changing the wording, the Nevada Press Association felt very comfortable that they could still take those photos and not be charged with this. We went through that a few times with the Nevada Press Association and others to make sure that we were taking care of that type of issue. They felt very comfortable with the language. Also, this is knowingly and intentionally capturing an image of a private area of another.

Assemblyman Segerblom:
Does any other state have a law like this?

Ben Graham:
I am not certain about the number of states, but there are several that do have this type of prohibition.

Assemblyman Segerblom:
Is there any history of it being abused in any prosecutions?

Ben Graham:
In light of what happened with the Lacrosse team at Duke University, it may have been abused, but we are not aware of it.

Assemblyman Horne:
Paparazzi and celebrities in southern Nevada are not uncommon. I remember the image of Marilyn Monroe with air blowing up her skirt. There was another celebrity in Las Vegas getting out of a limousine and had no undergarments underneath. Is there danger of that being prosecuted?

Ben Graham:
No, there is not. A comfort zone can be found in subsection 8(e). This is to protect us where we think we have reasonable privacy. Those people know they are displaying themselves, and the situation would not be reasonable for them to assume that there would be privacy.

Assemblyman Horne:
I would agree. But the person getting out of the limousine not wearing undergarments may not have had intentions of that being caught on image.

Robert Roshak, Sergeant, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:
We stand in support of this bill. This gives law enforcement the tool to deal with these things.

Frank Adams, Executive Director of the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:
We do support this bill. I have been around for the past sessions while this has been worked on, and I think that we have a product now that should diminish any fears. We need to have a tool to deal with this problem when the privacy of individuals is violated.

Assemblyman Mabey:
A scenario was brought up about taking a picture of the private area of a celebrity. If the celebrity wanted to prosecute, what would happen?

Robert Roshak:
It would depend on the circumstances. It would depend on how the picture was taken, where it was taken, if it was in plain view or public, et cetera. We would bring in the district attorney's office to have them review it also to see if it does carry and have prosecutorial merit.

Chairman Anderson:
Let us now move to those in opposition. Ms. Rowland sent a document to be distributed to the Committee (Exhibit C).

Lee Rowland, Representative, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:
The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) has submitted proposed amendments. Our concerns with this bill echo the questions asked by Assemblyman Horne and Assemblyman Mortenson. The reasonable expectation of privacy is something that is the foundation for our Fourth Amendment and privacy laws. The definition of privacy is a fact-specific determination by a court that must be objective and subjective. That means that an expectation of privacy must be subjective, meaning that you believe you have an expectation of privacy, and it must be objective, meaning that a reasonable person would think they were in private. The important middle ground is the issues such as with Janet Jackson, Britney Spears, and Marilyn Monroe. All of those situations are ones where the person could credibly claim a subjective expectation of privacy, but under current jurisprudence they would not have a reasonable objective expectation of privacy in public areas. Section 8 redefines the reasonable expectation of privacy to be a purely subjective definition that does not square with existing law. Section 8 makes this bill particularly susceptible to a constitutional challenge because it will criminalize situations such as those. While we may have assurances from prosecutors to trust their better judgment, unfortunately, the plain language of this bill does allow for prosecution of people who have merely a subjective expectation of privacy. As you can see under 8(e) 1 and 2, they are both subjective and they are separated by an "or". This does not match up with what a reasonable expectation of privacy is under the Nevada and federal constitutions.

As written, I do not believe this bill is going to withstand a legal challenge. During the Senate hearings, I listened to Senator Cegavske's testimony and tried to craft the textual suggestions in such a way that will still get at all of the situations she and Ben Graham listed as problematic. I have suggested eliminating the definition of reasonable expectation of privacy and simply leaving it how it is in current law. It would be up to the court or prosecutor to prove that element under established case law. It would not create the inconsistency that this does. The second suggestion we have is to delete the creation of a felony for someone who has reason to know that the picture they are publishing was taken in violation of this section. That would impose a duty on all magazines, tabloids, and newspapers to guess from the appearance of a photo whether or not the specific factual situation, under which the photo was taken, would lead to a charge. I do not think that is going to be sustainable either. I do not think the standard of knowledge, and the duty to inspect, is high enough to pass constitutional muster when you are talking about the first amendment

and the freedom of the press. We have suggested criminalizing the distribution, transmittal, or publication of an image by the person who took the picture, but not creating a duty on a third party to ascertain whether this picture was taken in violation to this section. What it would literally do is criminalize every tabloid that showed a photograph of Janet Jackson, Britney Spears, or Marilyn Monroe. Whether or not prosecutors would choose to prosecute those cases is not a good enough reason to tighten the language of this bill so that it is constitutional. If this Committee considers our amendments, you will see that every situation named by the proponents of this bill would still be covered. It would certainly give them a tool to go after people who are intentionally invading privacy. As written, this bill does have unintended consequences and covers all of the conduct that was mentioned by the people asking questions. I urge you to take a look at this document. We do believe it would accomplish what the sponsor is hoping to accomplish without having the serious federal First Amendment problems it currently has.

Chairman Anderson:
Did you share your amendments with Senator Cegavske?

Lee Rowland:
I did, but during work session this document was not considered. I created this document in response to a willingness to take a look at it from Senator Cegavske and the Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I watched that work session, but this document was not presented there. I am not sure if it was because they disagreed with the substance, or if there was an administrative error getting it to them.

Chairman Anderson:
I ask because I notice this is redated for today and directed toward me. Have you shared this document with Senator Cegavske directly?

Lee Rowland:
Yes, I sent this to her, Chairman Amodei, and all of the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee before the work session. I did not talk to Senator Cegavske personally about it.

Assemblyman Horne:
I am curious about your explanation on expanding the reasonable expectation of privacy. It seems to me that if you step outside the confines of your home, that expectation goes away. For example, you are walking down the street and the wind blows up your skirt and someone captures the image of your undergarments, and you see that published on the Internet. Are you telling me that should not be punishable?

Lee Rowland:
If one is a celebrity, no.

Assemblyman Horne:
So because you are a celebrity, you fall victim to the unexpected whims of Mother Nature to reveal your privacy to the public, and therefore it is not punishable. But if Ms. Rowland is exposed, then the person is punishable. That seems to be an unfair standard to me.

Lee Rowland:
I do not think it would be punishable for me or for Marilyn Monroe. It is an unfortunate occurrence, but the line is very blurry. This bill pertains to undergarments where women have low-slung jeans and bend over revealing underwear. That is unfortunate and it may be unintentional. When you are out in public and something is unintentionally exposed, it must be hinged on a reasonable objective expectation of privacy to be prosecuted. In a situation where you are in a casino and someone has a camera on their shoe looking up your skirt, even though you are in public, you would clearly have a reasonable expectation of privacy. Any objective person would believe that underneath their skirt is a private area. When the wind blows, unfortunately, that is the reality of wearing a short skirt. You do not have an objectively reasonable expectation to never be exposed when the wind is blowing. I believe it violates the First Amendment to criminalize that behavior without hinging it to the currently defined reasonable expectation of privacy. It is not that you never have privacy in public; it is that it must be based on a fact-specific investigation.

Assemblyman Horne:
What we are trying to do is make that line more clear by saying that while the wind may blow your skirt up, I do not have to immediately avert my eyes, but it is not unreasonable for you to think that image will not be caught on a digital medium and shared with the world. In that split second when the wind showed your private area to whomever may have been around, you had a reasonable expectation that somebody in Europe or Asia would not see that as well.

Lee Rowland:
My textual amendments would not in any way prevent a court from finding a reasonable expectation of privacy in that situation. All they would do is charge the prosecution with proving that element beyond a reasonable doubt by looking at current case law. Although I do not know offhand if anybody has ever been found to have a reasonable expectation of privacy based on a wind incident, my amendments would not prevent that finding. They would simply tether it to existing law.

Assemblyman Carpenter:
If we follow your suggestion and take out the entire section, we are really harming this bill and going directly against what you just argued, which is that in certain circumstances you have the reasonable expectation of privacy. Your amendment would delete that.

Lee Rowland:
I am not sure what you are referring to. I would still include the phrase "reasonable expectation of privacy," but I would not define it in a way that is contrary to current law.

Assemblyman Carpenter:
Under current law they are not able to prosecute on these situations.

Lee Rowland:
This criminal offense does not exist yet. We certainly do not have an objection to making this a criminal offense. The inclusion of the reasonable expectation should be the one that already exists in law. The reason they cannot prosecute this is because this crime does not exist, not because the reasonable expectation of privacy does not exist.

Assemblyman Cobb:
It was your testimony today that the reasonable person standard is an objective standard. Is that correct?

Lee Rowland:
Yes.

Assemblyman Cobb:
Both circumstances which are described in Section 8(e), subsections 1 and 2, rely upon a reasonable person standard. If reasonable person is an objective standard, how are you then turning it into a subjective standard?

Lee Rowland:
I am glad that the reasonable person standard is here and it certainly makes it less objectionable than it would be. It is the fact that there is an "or" connecting the two, which means they both stand alone. It basically says, "in which a reasonable person would believe his private area would not be visible to the public regardless of whether he is in a public or private place." That goes beyond what is generally accepted in constitutional law as the reasonable person standard because it is based on one's belief of whether or not their private area would be shown, regardless of where they are. The actual language of this is a little clunky and it clouds the issue unnecessarily. All I am

suggesting is simplifying the bill to get rid of this definition because this opens it up to situations where people reasonably believe that their private area should not be visible, but it becomes visible perhaps due to a force of nature. This language opens it up to expand the definition beyond what is now acceptable under the Fourth Amendment. It is bad policy to have two different definitions of what a reasonable expectation of privacy is in the law. There is so much law on this topic by simply not defining it in this bill, and instead just saying "reasonable expectation of privacy." There are plenty of cases available to prosecutors to show when a reasonable expectation might exist.

Assemblyman Cobb:
You are aware of case law that suggests that individuals who are homeless still have a reasonable right to privacy, even though they are out in the open. I do not understand your explanation when it expressly says that it is a reasonable person standard—when case law has extended the right to privacy on the reasonable person standard to public areas for individuals. I do not understand your objection to this, and I do think that case law would uphold this.

Chairman Anderson:
Ms. Cegavske, Lee Rowland indicated that she believed she sent you this material. Did you have a chance to look over it?

Senator Cegavske:
No, I have not seen this before. I do not sit on the Senate Judiciary Committee itself, so I was not there for the work session. The Chair did not indicate that there were any objections or any material presented.

Chairman Anderson:
Is there anything else you wanted to add to our discussion of the bill?

Senator Cegavske:
With all due respect to the opposition, the bill has been worked and thoroughly thought out.

Chairman Anderson:
Let me close the hearing on S.B. 10.

According to the exhibit materials on the Senate side, they did take the amendment as part of the process.

Let me open the hearing on Senate Bill 57.

Senate Bill 57: Requires the parent of a child who is the victim of a sexual offense to give written consent before the name of the child may be included in a notice provided to a school. (BDR 5-669)

Senator Valerie Wiener, Clark County Senatorial District No. 3:
This bill would require the parent of a child who is the victim of a sexual offense to give written consent before the name of the child victim may be included in a notice provided to a school.

This bill is a "cleanup," "housekeeping," or a "modest tweaking" of existing law. There were about 300 sections of law that we took from those repealed statutes, and put them all into one place so that you could navigate the juvenile justice issues in our State. This bill would give the opportunity for young people who have been the victims of sexual offenses and their families to make the decision whether or not their name is released to the school district. The current law requires the name to be released. Based on my discussions with the parole and probation officers who work daily with these young victims, one of the most important tools to reattain a sense of personal empowerment and building the road back to what we hope would be a normal life for that victimized child, is the opportunity to make the decision of whether or not to release that child's name. I have worked with people from the school districts, as well as Department of Parole, and Probation and I have promised that if this does not work the way we intend, I would come back and revisit it next session. I have every confidence that this will help the families rebuild their lives. I also encourage them to build a consent form that would be required and heavily loaded with all of the reasons why it would be an advantage to provide the name to the school, but it is a choice that we are offering the families.

Chairman Anderson:
The difficulty is that the victim and the attacker could end up in the same class because there is only one or two classes being taught on a certain subject, especially in smaller schools. How will the schools deal with this issue if they are not made aware? Having to see the attacker every day would cause the victim to be revictimized. But if the school knew about the attack in advance, they would be able to make sure that they avoid conflict. Will administration be completely eliminated from this matter?

Senator Wiener:
This bill would not prevent the name of the child from being released and the notice being given; that is not what this accomplishes. This would allow the family to make the choice. The idea of the revictimization actually starts for many of these young people when they feel powerless about whether or not they have the choice to release their names. From what I understand, there

have been unintentional incidents where the names has been released not to just school officials, but into the schools as well. That sense of being revictimized by peers just because they know about it is something the child has to deal with. What I have encouraged the school district representatives and juvenile justice professions to do, is work closely with the parent when signing the consent form. They must explain the advantages of releasing the name to the school. If for any reason this is an inappropriate tool, I will come back again to address it next session.

Assemblyman Horne:
Just to clarify, this still permits the notification because paragraph 3 says that it must include the name of each victim if the parent or guardian consents in writing. If they do not consent in writing, what does the notification include?

Senator Wiener:
It is still mandated that the offender's name will be provided. If the parents do not give permission, the name of the victim will not be released to the superintendent of that school district. This does not prevent them from giving permission; it just gives them the empowerment tool to say yes or no about releasing the name of their child.

I understand that the professionals from juvenile justice are monitoring the offender very closely. Part of the process is that they can take the offender out of a school at any time.

Chairman Anderson:
There is a problem, when there are only a few classes on a particular subject, that makes scheduling the victim and the offender to insure they get the class but not in the same room.

Senator Wiener:
When I talked with school district representatives as well as juvenile justice professions, I stressed emphatically that the consent form would be very heavily loaded in the advantages of providing the consent for the release to the parent before they sign off or do not sign off.

Craig Kadlub, Representative, Clark County School District:
Our first concern is having all the available information in order to meet the needs of the child as best we can. We appreciate the right to privacy of the family and the child. In instances where a child may move out of an attendant zone and into another zone to escape the incident, it may be in the parents' best interest to withhold that information. As Senator Wiener stressed, the form that the juvenile court system has agreed to devise would help the parents

make an educated decision; it would not be a knee-jerk reaction because they are ashamed and do not want anyone to know. It would actually be an educational tool for them so they would know that they may be forgoing certain protections by failing to disclose, such as having their child placed in the classroom of the cousin of the perpetrator. If the parents are in a position to make an educated decision, we fully support and respect their decision. If they find themselves in a situation where they would like to inform the school at a later date, there is nothing that would prevent them from doing so.

Anne Loring, Representative, Washoe County School District:
We spoke with Senator Wiener when the bill was on the Senate side about the kinds of scenarios that the Chairman described. We had a conflict when the meeting was scheduled with the juvenile justice people and were not able to participate. Mr. Kadlub has described their conclusions relative to those meetings and we are supportive of them.

Chairman Anderson:
The unintended consequences of this may be that if you are not successful at the primary, middle, or high school level in receiving your diploma, your likelihood of showing up in an institution in our State goes up dramatically. If the scheduling issue prevents the child from having an opportunity to be in all of the classes because there is a conflict, are the educational opportunities going to be limited because of information? Had the school district contemplated the issue of the victim and the perpetrator being in the same classroom when you were involved in this discussion on the Senate side?

Craig Kadlub:
Yes, we looked at all of the plausible scenarios and in the end felt that it is a family decision. If it reaches a point where a student feels like his education is being inhibited by lack of disclosure, then the family still may disclose. The responsibility rests with the parent and child.

Cheryln "Cherie" K. Townsend, Representative, Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators; Director, Department of Juvenile Justice Services, Clark County:
We understand and share your concerns about the safety of victims in our schools. Currently, our practice, in all of our juvenile justice systems, is to implement safety plans where we do not place an offender in the same school as the victim. We take extreme measures in working with the schools to make sure that your concerns do not occur. That may mean moving kids to different schools, private school, home school or any number of options that are available to us. To date, I do not think that any of us have ever encountered a situation where we have not been able to accommodate the school, the educational

needs, and opportunities of the offender or the victim. In working with the school district and Senator Wiener, we have committed to making sure that if a parent and a young victim chose to not release his name, we would still implement the same sort of safety plans to ensure that he is safe and protected, even though his name is not released to the schools. We have committed to doing that and ensuring that the parents and the victim understand that an important part of the healing and safety process is to notify the schools. If not, they need to know how important it is that they keep us informed if there are any moves or any changes that would cause us to have to change the safety plan.

Chairman Anderson:
Have you found that you had good cooperation from the school district in implementing your plan so that the perpetrator is the one having to move and that the victim has the greatest comfort level?

Cheryln "Cherie" K. Townsend:
Yes, we have had very good relationships and collaboration with the schools. We have been able to ensure that the victim is safe and if any movement occurs, it is the offender who moves. We would continue to give the victim a comfort level.

Michael J. Pomi, Representative, Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators; Director, Department of Juvenile Services, Washoe County:
I will echo the sentiments of my colleague. In Washoe County, we experience the same issues and we have great cooperation with our school district. We are in support of the bill as written, and we want to support the victims' right to be protected. We work closely with our school district to make sure the alternative measures for the educational needs of both children are met. Paramount, though, is that we protect the victim.

Michael Pedersen, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Elko County Juvenile Probation Department:
I support the comments that have been made by my colleagues as well. We have a great support system in collaboration with our school district. Our superintendent is our juvenile probation committee, so we are able to address any concerns right away. Our department and our county do support this bill.

Assemblyman Carpenter:
There may be a situation in a small town where you may not be able to move the children around. How would you handle that?

Michael J. Pomi:
We look at the alternatives, and in the smaller rural jurisdictions home schooling is the first option. We have discussed that, and that is the practice we have amongst the state juvenile justice administrators. They work with the local school districts to have the child attend home schooling so that they are not with the victim at that point. We have had to utilize that option in the past week to keep the child out of the school system until we could deliberate and decide what to legally do with the child. We do have measures in effect throughout the smaller rural jurisdictions to protect the victim.

Chairman Anderson:
Is there anyone to speak in opposition S.B. 57? [There were none.] Let me close the hearing on S.B. 57.

> ASSEMBLYMAN CARPENTER MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 57.
>
> ASSEMBLYMAN SEGERBLOM SECONDED THE MOTION.
>
> THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN HORNE AND ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Meeting adjourned [at 9:23 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Kaci Kerfeld
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Assemblyman Bernie Anderson, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Judiciary

Date: April 18, 2007 **Time of Meeting: 8:13 a.m.**

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S. B. 10	C	Lee Rowland, ACLU of Nevada	Testimony and proposed amendments